

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: see form PCT/ISA/220		Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i> see from PCT/ISA/210 (page 2)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/053020	International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 11/19/2004	Priority date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 2/26/2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G01K1/26, G01K7/20		
Applicant ROBERT BOSCH GMBH		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ european Patent Office Munich	Authorized officer Thomte, M
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/053020

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/053020

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-8	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-8	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-8	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

see supplementary page

Re Sections V and VIII

1. The presumed opinion of the Examiner will be that Claims 1 through 8 meet the requirements regarding novelty and inventive step and the requirements regarding commercial applicability as defined in Articles 33 (2), (3) and (4) PCT. However, if the patent application is to be pursued, the following objections regarding clarity will have to be taken into account.
2. Although Claim 1 refers to a method for pressure-independent temperature determination, no clear steps are defined in Claim 1 to show how to arrive at the desired measured temperature value. In general, it could be asserted that Claim 1 tends to refer to the creation of a diaphragm (device claim!) rather than to clear method steps which result in the desired temperature, and gives the impression that the object for which patent protection is sought does not correspond to the object defined in the claims and therefore lacks clarity (Article 6 PCT) even if the description is used for interpreting the claims.
3. Furthermore, it is unclear with the current wording to what extent the resistors - which are used for the temperature measurement - are also used for the pressure measurement. However, this does seem to be the case with reference to the description, which should also be reflected in the claim in order to establish a clear correspondence between Claim 1 and the description.

4. The "metal diaphragm" mentioned in Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 is not previously defined.
5. Since the claims mentioned above are not clear, they fail to meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.